

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11-14, 16-25 and 28-37 are all the claims pending in the application, where claims 1, 11, 14 and 25 are amended, and claim 37 is added.

***Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112***

Claims 1, 11, 14 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that recited feature of “a connection between the remote application and the data source desired to be monitored” in claims 1, 14 and 25 is unclear as to what element (the connection or the data source) is desired to be monitored. Regarding claim 11, the Examiner asserts that claim 11 lacks proper antecedent basis for the phrase “the data” and is dependent on now canceled claim 10.

Claims 1, 14 and 25 are amended and no longer recite the phrase “desired to be monitored”.

Claim 11 is amended to depend from claim 1, and to ensure proper antecedent basis.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 11, 14 and 25 are definite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

***Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 - Polizzi in view of Lamberton***

Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11-14, 16-25 and 28-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Polizzi et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0023158; hereinafter “Polizzi”) in view of Lamberton et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,779,017; hereinafter “Lamberton”), in further view of

DeBettencourt et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,279,001; hereinafter "DeBettencourt"). For at least the following reasons applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The Examiner asserts that modifying Polizzi's system with Lamberton would result in a system such that a request is first submitted through the service manager which handles disposition of the request. After routing the request to the appropriate service agent, the service agent would return a response directly to the user; or in other words, connect directly to the user and communicate the response independently of the service broker (Office Action, page 3).

Applicant respectfully submits that such a modification is contrary to the teachings of Polizzi. Polizzi clearly discloses that the service broker provides location transparency so that users are unaware of the actual location of the back-end servers or the service agents within the portal system (paragraph 36). If Polizzi's service agents were to connect directly to the user, the user would become aware of the "actual location" of the service agents, thereby frustrating Polizzi's purpose of protecting the portal system from the user. Instead, Polizzi teaches the service broker acting as a gateway between users and the service agents within the portal system (paragraph 35). In this way, communication from either a user or a service agent directed toward the other would pass through the service broker allowing the location of the service agent to remain unknown to the user.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11-14, 16-25 and 28-36 are patentable over the applied references.

***Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 - Polizzi in view of Albert***

Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11-14, 16-25 and 28-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Polizzi et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0023158; hereinafter "Polizzi") in view of

Albert et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,970,913; hereinafter "Albert"), in further view of DeBettencourt et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,279,001; hereinafter "DeBettencourt"). For at least the following reasons applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The Examiner provides "similar remarks" to those provided on the combination of Polizzi and Lamberton "to the 103(a) rejections of Polizzi in view of Albert" (Office Action, page 3). The Examiner seems to be asserting that modifying Polizzi in view of Albert would result in a system such that a request is first submitted through the service manager which handles disposition of the request. After routing the request to the appropriate service agent, the service agent would return a response directly to the user; or in other words, connect directly to the user and communicate the response independently of the service broker.

As noted above, Applicant respectfully submits that such a modification is contrary to the teachings of Polizzi. Polizzi clearly discloses that the service broker provides location transparency so that users are unaware of the actual location of the back-end servers or the service agents within the portal system (paragraph 36). If Polizzi's service agents were to connect directly to the user, the user would become aware of the "actual location" of the service agents, thereby frustrating Polizzi's purpose of protecting the portal system from the user. Instead, Polizzi teaches the service broker acting as a gateway between users and the service agents within the portal system (paragraph 35). In this way, communication from either a user or a service agent directed toward the other would pass through the service broker allowing the location of the service agent to remain unknown to the user.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11-14, 16-25 and 28-36 are patentable over the applied references.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Application No.: 09/750,432

Attorney Docket No.: A8645  
IBM Ref.: STL919990134US2

***New Claims***

Applicant adds new claim 37, support for which may be found throughout the specification. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 37 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 1 and at least for the subject matter recited therein.

***Conclusion***

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/142133

**46159**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Respectfully submitted,



J. Warren Lytle, Jr.  
Registration No. 39,283

Date: November 13, 2007